

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1-4 and 23-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Smith et al. (US 6,574,487).

Claims 7-22 and 29-44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith et al. in view of Kaneko (US 2002/0176036).

Claims 1-44 stand rejected on grounds of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting over copending U.S. Application No. 10/834,848.

The Specification is objected to for allegedly failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter.

The Drawings are objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) for allegedly not showing every feature of the invention specified in the claims.

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicants have amended claims 1, 7, 17, 23, 29, and 39 to further define the invention. Accordingly, claims 1-44 are pending.

Drawing Objections

The Drawings are objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) for allegedly not showing every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Specifically, the Office Action alleges that the combination of features recited by originally-filed claims 5, 6, 27, and 28 are not shown in the drawing figures. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Applicants respectfully assert that FIG. 4 clearly shows that the liquid crystal panel 330 may function in a TN mode, such that when the first front light 311 is in an ON state, an image displayed on the rear side of the liquid crystal panel 330 is in a black mode (i.e., “applied voltage”). Similarly, FIG. 4 clearly shows that when the second front light 321 is in an OFF state, an image displayed on the front side of the liquid crystal panel 330 is in a white mode (i.e., “non voltage”).

In addition, Applicants respectfully assert that FIG. 5 clearly shows that the liquid crystal panel 330 may function in a TN mode, such that when the second front light 321 is in an ON state, an image displayed on the front side of the liquid crystal panel 330 is in a black mode (i.e., “applied voltage”). Similarly, FIG. 5 clearly shows that when the first front light 311 is in an OFF state, an image displayed on the rear side of the liquid crystal panel 330 is in a white mode (i.e., “non voltage”).

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that at least FIGs. 4 and 5 clearly show every feature recited by claims 5, 6, 27, and 28. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to the Drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) be withdrawn.

Specification Objections

The Specification is objected to for allegedly failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. Accordingly, Applicants have amended paragraphs [0042] and [0045] to provide explicit description of the features recited by originally-filed claims 5, 6, 27, and 28. Applicants respectfully assert that no new matter has been added to the Specification, and that full support for the amendments to the Specification may be found in originally-filed claims 5, 6, 27, and 28, as well as the disclosure of the originally-filed

Specification. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to the Specification be withdrawn.

Nonstatutory Obviousness-Type Double Patenting

Claims 1-44 stand rejected on grounds of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting over copending U.S. Application No. 10/834,848. Initially, Applicants respectfully assert that since U.S. Application No. 10/834,848 has now issued as U.S. Patent No. 7,015,989, the rejection of claims 1-44 has been treated as a non-provisional nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection. Applicants respectfully request formal citation of U.S. Patent No. 7,015,989 on a form PTO-892 in the next Communication from the Office to ensure proper acknowledgement that U.S. Patent No. 7,015,989 has been considered by the Examiner.

Applicants concurrently submit herewith a Terminal Disclaimer to obviate the rejection of claims 1-44 on grounds of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1-44 on grounds of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting be withdrawn.

All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-4 and 23-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Smith et al. (US 6,574,487), and claims 7-22 and 29-44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith et al. in view of Kaneko (US 2002/0176036). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections on grounds that the applied references, whether taken singly or combined, fail to teach or suggest the combination of features recited

by amended independent claims 1, 7, 13, 21, 27, and 33 and 21, and hence dependent claims 2-6, 8-12, 14-20, 22-26, 28-32, and 34-40.

Independent claims 1, 7, and 17, as amended, recite a dual LCD device including, in part, first and second front light units, “wherein the first and second front light units are disposed at a full area of the liquid crystal panel.” Similarly, independent claims 23, 29, and 34, as amended, recite a method of fabricating a dual LCD device including, in part, steps of providing first and second front light units, “wherein the first and second front light units are disposed at a full area of the liquid crystal panel.”

In contrast to Applicants’ claimed invention, Smith et al. explicitly requires light sources 72 and 74 disposed on top and bottom portions 62 and 66, respectively, of the display 12. Accordingly, each of the light sources 72 and 74 are disposed at only a portion of the display 12. Thus, Smith et al. fails to teach or suggest that the light sources are “disposed at a full area” of the display, as required by amended independent claims 1, 7, 17, 23, 29, and 39, and hence dependent claims 2-6, 8-16, 24-28, 30-38, and 40-44.

In addition, Applicants respectfully assert that Kaneko fails to remedy the deficiencies of Smith et al., as detailed above, since Kaneko is completely silent with regard to multiple light sources positioned at a common side of a liquid crystal panel, as required by amended independent claims 1, 7, 17, 23, 29, and 39, and hence dependent claims 2-6, 8-16, 24-28, 30-38, and 40-44. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that the combination of Smith et al. and Kaneko fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with regard to claims 1-44.

For at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully asserts that claims 1-44 are neither taught nor suggested by the applied prior art references, whether taken alone or in combination. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(e) and 103(a) should be withdrawn because the above-discussed novel combination of features are neither taught nor suggested by any of the applied references.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner believe that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

Date: June 13, 2006

By: _____



David B. Hardy
Reg. No. 47,362

Customer No. 09629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Telephone: 202-739-3000